14.13

Vindication of the Rev. Horatio Southgate:

A

LETTER

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES,

FROM

THE REV. HORATIO SOUTHGATE,

THEIR

MISSIONARY AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

NEW-YORK:
STANFORD AND SWORDS,
139 BROADWAY.
1844.

WM. OSBORN, PRINTER,
88 William-street,

PREFATORY NOTE.

The letter which follows is in answer to certain charges made against the Rev. Horatio Southgate, the Missionary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at Constantinople.

The nature of these accusations may be gathered from the following extracts from a communication, which appeared in the New-York Observer of the 18th November last.

"The recent slaughter of the Independent Nestorians, and its known connection with the efforts of Mr. Badger, an English Puseyite Missionary, to drive the Missionaries of the American Board from that interesting field, have excited a desire somewhat extensively, to understand the policy of the various Missions in that part of the world. * * * * * * *

"At the late meeting of the American Board at Rochester, an inquiry was made concerning some interference that had lately been experienced at some of the Missions. According to the report in the Vermont Chronicle, which happens to be at hand, and which is probably as correct and lucid as any that has been given—

'This called up Dr. Anderson, who remarked that the allusions made in the report of the Prudential Committee, refer to a Mr. Badger, whose course has been exceedingly reprehensible. * * * * * On his arrival at Constantinople, his course was one of open and decided hostility to the American Missionaries. As far as his influence went, he coincided entirely with the Papal Missionaries, and has evinced the same hostility to any movements in

favor of evangelical religion as they do. His efforts contributed very much—not solely, for unfortunately another untoward influence, emanating from a quarter nearer home, was there to co-operate with him—or rather, perhaps, to use him—to bring round that state of things which has resulted in shutting up Mr. Dwight's church in Constantinople, and in driving to this country Hohannes, his devoted Christian assistant. * * * * *

'Rev. Dr. Tappan desired to know to what other adverse influence Dr. Anderson alluded.

'Dr. Anderson replied as no harm could come from telling the whole truth, he would frankly state—the Rev. Horatio Southgate, Missionary of the Episcopal Society in this country. He has co-operated with Mr. Badger in all the opposition made to the Missionary operations of the Board, and has, as far as his influence has gone, coincided with the Papal Missionaries.'

"To many, this statement has doubtless appeared astonishing, and almost incredible. * * * * * All at once, the public is informed that the American Episcopalian Mission in Turkey has been exerting itself to oppose and defeat the labors of the Missions of the American Board; and with such success, as to compel the suspension of its public worship on the Sabbath, and drive one of its devoted native friends into exile! To none will this fact appear more astounding than to many of those by whose contributions Mr. Southgate has been sustained, and who, had they understood this to be a part of the 'plan' of that Mission, would have put an effectual veto upon the execution of it."

Mr. Southgate submits this vindication of himself, to the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

May, 1844.

LETTER, &c.

I HAVE BEEN DESIRED to give a narrative of the slaughter of the Nestorians—of my efforts against the papists—and of my difficulties with the Missionaries of the American Board, for the purpose of meeting the calumnies which have been circulated in the United States, respecting our Missions in the East.

On the first of these points I have already forwarded a statement.* I know not that any thing need be added to the account which I then gave of the Nestorian Massacre. The facts which I stated prove, beyond all question, that there is not one word of truth in the calumny which the enemies of the English Mission have endeavored to fasten upon Mr. Badger; but I may add a few words more to show how unworthy is that report to be believed. Look for a moment at the evidence on which it is based—the letter of an anonymous writer to a London Newspaper. This letter does not present one clear fact in support of it. It is conjectural throughout—a mere theory of his own imagination. Once more, the letter itself does not sustain the accusation made against Mr. Badger. It implicates him only in common with the American Congregationalists and the Roman Catholics, but attaches the greatest blame to him.

The only fact, however, which he pretends to allege, implicates the Congregationalists and no others; which is, that their mission buildings in the mountains were reported to be "forts," and that this excited the suspicions of the Pasha of Mossoul. This is

* The statement referred to has already been published in several of our religious journals, and is now printed as an appendix to this pamphlet.

true, and it is also true that the Pasha had manifested, all along, the utmost aversion to the proposed operations of the Congregationalists among the mountaineers. He had refused to grant them permission to enter the mountains: an application to the General Government, at Constantinople was equally unsuccessful; and to this day, the Congregational Mission has not advanced a step towards the accomplishment of its object. The only party against which there is any evidence that strong suspicions existed, is the Congregational, as they alone had actually commenced operations; and if these suspicions have led to the Massacre, the Congregationalists alone are responsible.

The only fact, then, which the writer adduces involves those alone whom he wishes to shield. I do not say that he is correct in inferring that these suspicions led to the massacre. I know that he is not. He does not show any connecting link between *them* and *it;* and it is obviously absurd to say that suspicions excited in the mind of the Pasha of Mossoul led to a massacre with which he had nothing to do. It is plain that the Pasha did nothing to hinder it; it is probable that he hoped that he might turn an invasion of the Nestorian country by others to his own advantage; but there is no proof whatever that he took a part in it. The massacre was accomplished by two Kurdish chiefs. It is evident that *they* could have no such suspicions as the writer attributes to the Pasha of Mossoul, for they both knew for what purpose the buildings were erected, and what were the designs of the American Missionaries. I do not say, then, that these last are justly implicated in the charge of bringing about the massacre; but those who take the letter referred to as good authority, are bound to believe this, because, so far as it pretends to adduce facts, they lead to this conclusion.*

The writer of that letter, is evidently ignorant of the history of the Nestorians during the last ten years. In my communication on that subject, I show enough of that history to make manifest the true causes of the massacre, and the absurdity of the story, that it arose from the "jealousies of rival missionaries." Within

* The writer does not pretend that these suspicions were conveyed to the Pasha of Mossoul by Mr. Badger, nor has any one ever intimated such a thing. They came from the Kurds, and were intended as a pretext to justify the invasion.

my recollection, a more groundless slander has not been palmed upon the world.

The communication to which I have referred, is, so far as I can gain any information upon the subject, the only authority upon which the charge against Mr. Badger is based. I have seen it copied into various papers, English and American, and I have seen no allusion to any other source of evidence. And now, is it not a little singular, is it not inexplicable, that if there were any truth in the report, it has not reached us in any of the letters written from the scene of action. The author of the report does not pretend to have received his information from Mossoul, and I am well assured that no such story ever originated there. I happen to have heard the opinion of all, or nearly all the persons, from whom authentic information on the subject has been received, and not one of them makes the least allusion to such a rumor, except to contradict it. The individuals to whom I refer, are the British Consul, the French Consul and the Nestorian Patriarch, two or three eminent Syrians, Mr. Badger and the American Missionaries themselves. None of these seem ever to have dreamed of attributing the massacre to Missionary rivalries, while the Nestorian Patriarch positively denies it, Mr. Badger declares that, so far as he is concerned, the letter is "a tissue of falsehood and misrepresentation;" and the American Missionaries, in all their reports which I have seen, impliedly contradict it by the account which they so give.* Can he suppose that these last, who have all along so bitterly complained of Mr. Badger's hostility to them, should not have alluded to its dreadful consequences, if it had been directly or indirectly the cause of the massacre; or that the Secretary of the American Board, while preferring the same complaint at the late meeting of the Board, should not have adduced this aggravated proof of its criminality, if it really existed. Let it be remembered then, that this idle report is based upon a letter from Constantinople, and that it is not confirmed by one of those competent to bear witness in the matter, while it is positively contradicted by some of them, and especially by the Patriarch, the person most deeply interested.

* See for example the account by Dr. Grant, in the Missionary Herald for November, 1843.

It may be asked, then, how it has come to pass that so much importance has been given to so insignificant a testimony. I answer by asking again, who are they who have attached importance to it, who have given it prominence, and repeated and repeated it, until men begin to think it true? They are, I reply, those and those only who were predisposed to believe it, who would be glad to find it true, who have an interest in reporting it as true.

So unimportant a testimony, and one so destitute of confirmation in the real history of the massacre, would have passed unnoticed and sunk at once into forgetfulness, if there had not been such persons as these to give it credence and currency. And why is it that this noble enterprize of the English Church has been so unsparingly denounced? Some will say, because Mr. Badger has from the first, assumed a position of hostility to the Congregational Missionaries, and has in a measure, made his work antagonist to theirs. This may be true in part, but it does not account for all the wrath which has been expended upon the Mission; and if I am able to show that this wrath existed before Mr. Badger was sent to Mossoul, it will be evident that it was not any opposition of his which at first provoked it. Upon this point, I am prepared to prove that the American Board, has from the beginning shown its opposition to the English Mission, and was predetermined to regard it unfavorably. The proof is of importance to *us*, as it helps to disclose the real motives which have operated in the attacks upon our own Missions. In 1838, before the American Board had commenced their Mission among the mountain Nestorians, the Church of England sent explorers into the country to survey the condition of the people, and to offer assistance to the Patriarch in the work of education. On account of unforeseen delays, they did not reach Kurdistan until after Dr. Grant, who had been despatched in the spring of 1839, had penetrated into the mountains. The Executive Committee of the American Board, in their Annual Report for 1841, pronounced this preparatory Mission of the English Church, a "partial interference with their own operations.*" As the explorers had received their instructions, and even been sent nearly a year before the first

* Thirty-second Annual Report of the A. B. C. F. M., September, 1841, p. 115.

of the Congregational Missionaries started for Kurdistan, it is difficult to imagine how the former can be charged with "interference," or why the term is not rather to be applied to the latter. At all events, it may well be asked by what right the American Board boast such an exclusive title to Missionary operations among the Nestorian Christians, that they can venture to call a friendly message from the English Church an "interference."* It is enough, however, to show that they were predisposed to look upon it with hostile feelings.

The result of the exploration was, that the Nestorian Patriarch requested that a *clergyman* from the English Church might be sent to him, (the first explorers were *laymen*,) and this, with other encouraging circumstances, led to the establishment of Mr. Badger's Mission. Previous, however, to its establishment, the project was strongly disrelished by the American Board, and some effort was made to prevent it. The following is an extract from a letter from the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Secretary of that Board to a gentleman in England. "If the Nestorians can be revived as a Church, let them be so by all means; should we be suffered to go on without interference from without, except by the Romanists, I have strong expectations that the Lord will make us the instruments of doing this. *But should the Propagation Society actively interfere, any one must see that they will make our influence more or less anti-Episcopal*, whatever may be our wishes and endeavours to the contrary." I adduce the passage to show with what feelings the American Board was prepared to receive the English Mission, and refrain therefore from all comments upon the implied threat which it contains. I will only add that it was written before that Mission was established. If it is pretended that the Mission was *designed* to be hostile to theirs, the assumption is altogether gratuitous, and I think I have the best means of knowing that it is contrary to truth.† The previously declared hostility

* Especially when they understood the object of the message to be, "to offer to establish schools among the Independent Nestorians, and to aid them in other ways," and so express it in their own Report. *Ibid.*

† I know not that it is pretended on any hand, that the English Mission was *originated* in opposition to the Mission of the American Board, but the writer of the letter to the London newspaper would seem to intimate this, and even ventures to insinuate that Mr. Badger was furnished with instructions for the purpose. I hardly need say that a grosser calumny was never uttered.

was based on other grounds, which I shall fully expose when I come to speak of our own Missions. I may add here, however, that the proposal of an Episcopal Mission to the Druzes, (which was never carried into effect) was met in the same way.

It will be seen from this, that antecedent to any opposition on the part of Mr. Badger, an opposition which arose in part from the hostile position assumed by the American Board, there was a disposition to oppose and calumniate the Episcopal Mission, and all the abuse which has been heaped upon it, is but the natural growth and expression of feelings which existed before that Mission was commenced. This growth may have been quickened by the opposition manifested by Mr. Badger, but that being as I have just said, in part the effect of the other, the American Board should charge themselves with producing what they complain of. At least it is with an ill grace that they now begin to utter complaints of hostility to their operations from the Episcopal Mission, when their own hostility to that Mission preceded not only its hostility to them, but its very existence.

No sooner had the Episcopal Mission commenced in Kurdistan, than the jealousy which had been before manifested, broke out into opposition. This opposition was not so clearly shown on the ground as at home, in England and America. Congregational Missionaries in this country will hardly venture to present themselves *to the Eastern Churches* in open and avowed hostility to the operations of the Episcopal Church. Such a course would entail certain ruin upon their labours, for it would bring out what they must seek to prevent—a knowledge of their real character, as destitute of those institutions which the Oriental Christians regard as inseparable from a Christian Church. They have, therefore, sought to bring discredit upon Episcopal Missions by assailing them at home, and the Mission in Kurdistan has been assailed in this way. Both in England and America, no means have been spared to make it appear that this Mission was a conspiracy against their own operations. The missionary, the Society which supported him, and the dignitaries of the Church who favored the enterprise, have been assailed with unmeasured abuse. The work has now been represented as "Puseyism," and now as "coinciding with Popery," evidently with no other

design than to injure its good name among members of the Church. The missionary has been charged with going to the Patriarch by stealth, and choosing a moment for the purpose when the Congregational missionary was absent; whereas the fact is that he went under positive instructions, and went at the time he did, because circumstances connected entirely with his own labors, rendered it necessary. I do not pretend to agree with all the private views, or to approve all the acts of the missionary alluded to. The position of hostility which he has assumed towards the Congregational missionaries in the country itself, was contrary to my earnest and oft-repeated advice. But I must say, in simple truth, that the things reported concerning him are false. The story of his "bribing the Patriarch" was fabricated out of the fact that, according to the universal custom of the East, he carried him a present. I am only astonished that the Congregational missionaries can have allowed themselves to originate the rumor, when they knew so well the meaning of such civilities, and had themselves done the same thing to a much greater extent. Next came the story of the massacre. Upon the first suggestion that it was brought about by the rivalries of missionaries, the enemies of the Episcopal Mission seized upon it, and succeeded in turning the cry against Mr. Badger, forgetting that their own Mission was chiefly implicated by the facts in the case. These things cannot be accounted for on any other ground than that jealousy of the Episcopal Mission which preceded its existence and has grown with its growth. The history of that Mission has helped to increase it. While the Episcopal Mission has advanced rapidly, and gained for itself the affection and confidence of the Patriarch, while it has established schools, relieved the wants of the Nestorians, sheltered the Patriarch in his calamity, received the refugees flying from the scene of the slaughter, clothed them, fed them, and instructed them, (all which it is still doing,) the Congregational Mission has failed to gain any sure footing, or to accomplish any of its designs, and the missionaries are now turning their attention to the Syrians, for whom our own Church has long since declared its intention of establishing a Mission, and has made every preparation for it. When our missionaries reach the country, we may expect another cry of "interference" and "opposition." It would be uncharita-

ble in us, and another proof of our hostility, to raise it ourselves! But, in truth, no such cry will ever be heard from an Episcopal missionary. If they would but fairly oppose us in the field, instead of circulating calumnies at home, it would be all that we could ask. It would test at once the comparative advantages of Episcopal and "anti-Episcopal" missions in these countries. It would show to the Eastern Christians what they are, and the result would soon follow. No Congregational Mission could long sustain itself in such a position; and the attempt, I will venture to say, will never be made. The war will be continued at home; newspapers and annual reports will be full of it; but *here* not a breath will be raised, nor a word uttered, to show that we are any way distinct from them. A fair and open opposition to our Missions *where they are*, would most powerfully contribute to their progress; it will not, therefore, be made. But if a missionary in the field replies to the aspersion cast upon him at home, not by violence and abuse, but by setting forth before the Eastern Christians the real distinction and differences between his own Church and the Congregational communion, (distinctions and differences which the Congregationalists ought neither to be ashamed nor afraid to have known,) he will be met, *not here but at home*, with every species of vituperation and abuse. What has been, will be; and the Church must be prepared to expect it.

I have dwelt so much at length upon the Mission to Kurdistan because it is chiefly from the history of that Mission that the things uttered against me have been drawn. I have been called a "Papist," because I have co-operated with that Mission, which had previously borne the charge, and an attempt, (horrid as the thought is,) has been made to implicate me in the Nestorian massacre, for the same reason. Besides, the history of that Mission shows, most clearly, the source of all the opposition which has befallen Episcopal Missions in general, and therefore I have spoken more at large about it. There is a current of hostility to Episcopal Missions in these countries which must have its way; and I see no better path for us than quietly to pursue our labors, and let the current roll on unheeded. It cannot injure us here; and I trust that it will not alarm those at home.

I now turn to the second point of inquiry, to give some account of my efforts against the Papists. This is intended to meet the monstrous charge, contained in the remarks of Dr. Anderson, at the meeting of the American Board, and the rumors that have grown out of them. That charge, as I find it reported in the New-York Evangelist, and the Vermont Chronicle, is, that I have, "as far as my influence has gone, coincided with the Papal Missionaries." Dr. Anderson declines holding himself responsible for this remark, saying that "he does not think he made any reference to Papal Missionaries when speaking of me." I might, therefore, let the subject drop as unworthy of further remark, if I had not been desired to speak out upon it. This, therefore, I will freely do.

I cannot but doubt the accuracy of Dr. Anderson's recollection, when I see the remark reported in two distinct newspapers, but I think if he did *not* make it, no candid person can hesitate to pronounce upon his conduct, in allowing the accusation to be circulated without contradiction. Though he will not suffer himself to be called to account for it, he can permit it to do the same injury as if he had acknowledged it. He lets it pass with all the confirmation which his name and office can give to it, but when pressed for his authority, flies from responsibility. In quarters where such principles of action operate, I have no hope of being treated with justice, and I solemnly protest against being judged by the testimony of witnesses, who are as willing to see me injured by falsehood as by truth.

But it is not from Dr. Anderson alone that this particular species of hostility has appeared, though his remarks (as reported) seem to have been the principal occasion of calling it out. In these days, the favorite way of assailing the Church is to accuse it of Popery, or a tendency thereto, and the same mode of attack is adopted towards our Missions in this country. In this way it is hoped to bring them in to discredit with at least a portion of our own Church at home. An article in the New-York Observer of November 18th, is prefaced by the editors with an appeal of this kind, and the writer of the article attempts to create a division among us in the same way. This species of warfare has now become so common, that I shall be surprised indeed, if it succeeds in deceiving any intelligent Churchman. I have long been familiar with

it in my own experience, but have never until now thought it worthy of notice. But once for all, I will put myself right with regard to it. When men apply these terms to me, I know not what they mean. If they wish to say that I have any personal or official connection with Papists, or that I approve their labors, or that I have the same designs and aims with them, or pursue the same modes of operation, or that my work in its tendencies has any affinity with theirs, can it be necessary for me to reply that the charge is a groundless, shameful and wicked slander? Or if by it be meant, that I have any leaning towards the Church of Rome, that I apologize for its corruptions, that I speak tenderly of it, or that I in anywise recommend it, can it be necessary for me to say, that of no man living is the charge less true than of me? Or if by it be intended, that I am not sincerely attached to my own Church as she is, that I do not love her with my whole soul as Protestant, and as Reformed, that I conceal her true character from these Eastern Communions, or have any disposition to sanction their corruptions, that I do not as faithfully protest against them as any missionary in the land, or that my work does not tend as directly as theirs to purify and elevate these Churches, I throw back such charges as contrary to truth, as utterly destitute of evidence, as without the shadow of a foundation in any thing real. Men may call me "Papist" if they please, and so they may call me a murderer, if they please; they may as well call me one as the other, so far as the evidence goes; but I cannot feel that I am called upon to answer such falsehoods. They defeat themselves, and surprised shall I be, if they do not awaken in the Church a spirit of zeal, such as our Missions in these lands have never called forth.

I will not trust myself to speak of this species of defamation as I think it deserves. But I will say that if the enemies of our Missions expect by it, to turn me a single hair's breadth from the course which I have been instructed to pursue, or to abandon one point of the principles on which I have been taught to base my work, they little know with whom they have to deal. Words of charity and love might move me; words of truth and reason would, I trust, convince me; but abuse and falsehood will only strengthen me to endure, and suffer, and persevere; and in thus enduring, suffering and persevering, I am sure I shall have the sympathy and prayers of the Church.

It has been justly said, that "if more of my private reports had been published, there would have been no shadow of foundation for this idle clamor about my co-operation with the Papists." My motive for withholding them from publication has been, that the general interests of my Mission required it, and the same motive now forbids my going into any details upon the subject. I cannot think that those interests should be suffered to receive detriment for the sake of answering such scandal as this. The authors of it, I fear, are beyond the reach of evidence. I cannot deal with them as with reasonable and candid men, for such men would not have fabricated so idle and baseless a rumor. As for the members of our own Church, I am slow to believe that any such evidence can be needed for *them*. If the time could ever come that my friends and supporters at home should feel that it was necessary for me to defend myself against such a charge as this, I should feel that the time had come for me to retire from my work. For the present purpose, I cannot but think it sufficient to declare that this charge is utterly without foundation in truth; nay more, that it is diametrically contrary to truth.

I will say, however, and I say it without any disposition to boast, that I firmly believe that the two or three Episcopal Missions in this country have done more, within the last two years, to counteract the designs of the Papists, and to recover those who were ensnared by their delusions, than the eight or ten Congregational Missions have accomplished during the twenty years of their existence. And I will say, moreover, that I have abundant evidence that the Papal missionaries regard the former, and not the latter, as the great obstacle in the way of their progress. All this will not appear strange to those who know how impossible it is for Congregationalism to produce any strong impression upon Churches constituted like those in the East, and how incapable it is of appearing as an antagonist power to a Church which, corrupt as it is, possesses those features which are universally recognized by the Eastern Christians as outward and visible signs of a Church of Christ.* *It* can only act upon here

* I here allude to such institutions as the Episcopacy, the Creed, a Liturgy, appointed Feasts and Fasts, &c. These are to an Eastern Christian the *primâ facie* evidence of a duly organized Church, the signs of it which appear at first view. If these are wanting, he will not inquire farther before he rejects, for the simple reason that he never heard or dreamed of a Church without them.

and there an individual, while the other, with far greater advantages for acting upon individuals, has also the power of acting upon masses. Our own Church possesses the same advantages and the same power. To them, under God, and not to ourselves, we owe whatever of greater efficiency we possess in opposition to the seductive arts of Rome. The result has been that not only individuals, but whole communities, have been preserved or turned back from Popery—an effect that Congregational Missions, from their very nature, can never be expected to produce. I freely accord to those Missions whatever of good they are enabled to accomplish. I rejoice in whatever of good I see resulting from them. I acknowledge the intelligence, the zeal, and the piety of those who are engaged in them. But personal qualities cannot overcome the defects of a system. *As Congregationalists* they labor, and must labor, at a disadvantage here; *and it is for not placing ourselves at the same disadvantage, by concealing our real character, that all this outpouring of wrath has come upon us.*

I now pass to the third topic of inquiry—"My difficulties with the Missionaries of the American Board;"—and here I shall use the utmost plainness of speech. Upon this point, at least, I have nothing to conceal, nothing to withhold. The only apprehension which I feel is, lest I should be censured for conceding too much, lest I should appear in some instances to have sacrificed usefulness for the sake of peace. Yet I hope to be judged as one who has sincerely acted for what he deemed to be the true interests of his Master's cause. If I have erred, through carrying conciliatory measures beyond what might be fairly expected of me, I can at least say that I never doubted the utility of my course until these recent assaults upon me have taught me how vain have been my best efforts to preserve peaceable and kindly feeling. May the Lord forgive those who have thus requited me!

In order to bring the subject fully to view, it is necessary for me to go back to a distant date. During the years 1836—39, I was employed in investigating the condition of Mohammedanism in Turkey and Persia. I had previously felt very little interest in the Eastern Churches. During my tour I was constantly brought into contact with the Oriental Christians, and had

occasion to observe their order of worship, their form of government, their rites, and their usages. I was particularly struck with their great resemblance to us, not only in the constitution of their ministry, but in their use of the same Creed, and in their general views and prepossessions, with regard to the nature and character of the Christian Church. I found myself, in a word, among Episcopalians, and was at once surprised and pleased with the numerous points of affinity between us. I could not, however, but see into how low a state they had fallen, through the oppression of Mohammedanism, the extinction of learning and the decline of piety. These things moved me to compassion, which was only deepened by the resemblances between us. I felt that we, as a Church, had neglected a duty in not ministering to the wants of this great portion of the "household of faith." In so far as we were one with them, in so far it seemed to me that the obligation resting upon us was greater than that which rested upon others, while the same oneness showed that our means of usefulness must also be greater. It is unnecessary to go farther into detail. I determined to turn my attention to them, and to give to them, if it should please the Lord to prosper me, the future labors of my life. I saw, or thought I saw, that our usefulness must depend, under God, mainly upon our acting in our true character as a branch of the Church of Christ—upon our making ourselves known as such—upon our recognizing the Eastern Churches also in their true character, as regularly organized Chistian Communions—upon our treating them with the respect due to such a character—upon our assuming intercourse with their spiritual Heads. In a word, I saw that appearing among them as representatives of an Episcopal Church, recognizing and approving what in them was ancient and excellent, using the means which they offered in themselves for their own restoration, encouraging them against Popery, strengthening them against schism, we should be in the best possible position for correcting error, for removing corruption, and for building them up, with the blessing of God, in a pure and primitive faith.

Accordingly, immediately after my return to the United States, I declared to the Foreign Committee the conclusion to which I had arrived. I then said, "my own observations have satisfied me that [acting upon thoroughly Episcopal principles,] is the only

plan upon which Missions from the Church of England, or of America to the Churches of the East, should be formed."* Soon after this, meeting with the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Secretary of the American Board, he alluded to this extract from my letter published in the "Spirit of Missions," and expressed himself in very strong terms *against the idea of making known the Episcopal Church distinctively among the Eastern Christians.* I was surprised at the earnestness of his remarks, and at the conclusion which he seemed to be drawing from them, as affecting the Congregational Missions in those parts. The subject had presented itself to my mind only with reference to our own Missions, as the using of a legitimate instrumentality which the Great Head of the Church had placed in our hands. It appeared to me as the simple performance of a duty to employ, in its place, our Episcopal character as one of the means of usefulness belonging to us; and it had never occurred to me that others could object to so natural and necessary a proceeding. I had yet to learn through what sorrow and suffering it was to be established.

During my year's sojourn in the United States, I had frequent opportunities of laying my views before the Foreign Committee, and especially before my long respected and beloved friend, the Rev. Dr. Vaughan, then Secretary. The result was, that after my appointment to Constantinople, I received both from the Foreign Committee and from the Venerable Presiding Bishop Griswold, ample instructions for the purpose of carrying out those views in my Missionary work among the Eastern Churches.† *In all my conferences with the Presiding Bishop, the Foreign Committee and the Secretary, I do not remember that the Missions of the American Board were ever alluded to; nor were my instructions intended to have any particular bearing upon them.* A writer in the New-York Observer of November 18, 1843, pretends to find in them special allusions to the A. B. C. F. M. Missions, but his "finding" is based entirely upon a forced construction, as I may show in a very few words. 1. He quotes from the

* Spirit of Missions, for February, 1839, p. 52.

† The latter were addressed to myself in connection with the Rev. J. J. Robertson, D. D., who had already removed from Syra, his former station, to Constantinople. Nothing that I could write, would more clearly express my own views than these admirable documents. You will find them in the "Spirit of Missions," vol. 5, 1840.

instructions of the Foreign Committee a passage in which are the following words: "The dangers which threaten this integrity [of the Oriental Churches] from without, and from the unguarded zeal of religious inquiry within, you have carefully observed and weighed; and by the blessing of God you may be an instrument in averting them." The writer affirms that "this passage certainly refers to the Missionaries of the American Board." I had always supposed that the "dangers from without," referred to the efforts of the Papists. As to the "unguarded zeal of religious inquiry within," it is doubtless an allusion to a state of things which I had found existing in certain parts of Turkey, where attempts were making by Eastern Christians themselves to create a schism in their Church, in a manner and spirit that had appeared to me most reckless and unchristian. This was a fact by itself, and one that required notice. If, as the writer says, "the Missionaries of the American Board have never attempted, nor desired to disturb the unity or integrity of any Oriental Church," the evil could not have come from their labors. But it did exist and required efforts to avert it. The instructions do not attribute it to any particular cause. They regard it as a state of things existing "within" the Eastern Churches, and there of course to be met. *There is no allusion to Missionaries of the American Board*, but the writer chooses to force such a construction upon it.

The obnoxious passage in the Instructions of the Presiding Bishop is the following, "You may farther state to them [the Bishops and other ecclesiastical authorities of the Eastern Churches,] that many of those called Protestants have rejected and are still so opposed to Episcopacy and Confirmation, and the use of Liturgies, that an intimate fellowship and connection with them, is at present impracticable." But is not this a plain matter of fact? And are the American Board and its supporters, for whom the writer after his own fashion of interpreting, supposes it to be particularly intended, ashamed or afraid to have it known of themselves? I am not allowed by this passage to oppose or speak evil of them, but merely to state a plain fact bearing upon Christian Communion and fellowship. And I may here say, that in using the passage during my two weeks' residence with the Syrian Patriarch, I do not remember that I ever alluded to the American Board or

its Missionaries. The passage itself contains no allusion to them, and I am well persuaded it was not so intended. The writer, however chooses again to force this special construction upon it.*

The only other extract on which the writer depends is the following, from the Bishop's letter to the Syrian Patriarch; "He [Mr. Southgate] will make it clearly understood that the American Church has no ecclesiastical connection with the followers of Luther and Calvin, and takes no part in their plans or operations to diffuse the principles of their sects." This was intended to guard against the application to ourselves, of the obnoxious terms referred to, for, as the person who draughted the letter, well knew, by a "follower of Luther or Calvin," is universally understood in the East an "infidel, a man destitute of all religion and a profaner of it." The Missionaries of the American Board, are careful enough to evade the application of these terms to themselves, and why should we be less so? The writer says, the passage "was certainly intended to apply to the Missionaries of the American Board, and to them principally, if not exclusively." The evidence of this, is his own determination so to apply it, and this is the rule of all his argument.

The writer adduces no farther proofs, but intimates that my "plan" for the Mesopotamia Mission, which, for obvious reasons, was not published, may contain something of the same kind. I have not looked at my own copy of that plan for a year and a half, nor shall I take the trouble to turn to it now. But so sure am I of the rules which have guided me in my missionary work, that I confidently affirm that no offensive allusion to the American Board, or its missionaries, is to be found in it.

When the writer says that the "policy of the American Board is well known to the Christian world," while "that of the American Episcopalians is in part carefully concealed," does he mean to affirm that the former has no "plans" which it withholds

* The extreme unfairness of the writer, and his evident determination to force a hostile interpretation upon the Instructions, is in nothing more apparent than in his entirely omitting the following passage in them, which speaks expressly upon our relations to Missionaries of other denominations, and directly contradicts the arbitrary explanation which he imposes upon another. "The standards of your own Church . . . . . do not require that you should appear in hostile array against Christians of any name; rejoice rather in whatever good they do," &c.

even from the congregations which sustain it? I happen to know that it has, and one in particular, on the mode of conducting their Eastern Missions, which has not been published, because it is feared that those who support that Board will not be able to bear it; whereas the "plan" for the Mission in Mesopotamia, and every thing else that I have written, I should rejoice to have read by every member of the Episcopal Church. The obvious imprudence of exposing our work to the Papists, the great enemies of our Missions, is the reason why some things are withheld from publication.

The article on which I have now been commenting, is a signal illustration of an antecedent prejudice against our Missions. It is this prejudice that prompts the writer to put new interpretations on documents which have remained unnoticed for years. It is this prejudice which I have already developed as existing from the beginning against the Episcopal Mission in Kurdistan, as appearing upon the first suggestion of a Mission to the Druzes, and as evinced by the Secretary of the American Board upon the earliest intimation of our intention to use the Episcopal character of our Church as a means of usefulness. It is the same prejudice which I will now farther develope, as it has met us in all our operations in these countries.

Immediately upon my arrival in Constantinople, the Missionaries of the American Board in this city signified to Dr. Robertson and myself, in a conference held at their request, their objection to the principle on which our Mission was based; the principle, namely, of bringing our own Church to light before the Oriental Communions. They wished that the differences among Protestants should not be known among the Eastern Christians. Very soon after, I received a verbal message from a missionary of the American Board in another city, to the effect that he entirely disapproved of the same principle. The language in which it was conveyed, forbad my taking any notice of it. About the same time, the Rev. Mr. Tomlinson, Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian knowledge, (now Bishop of Gibraltar,) arrived in the Levant, upon a special mission. In his interviews with the Episcopal Synod in Athens, and with the Patriarch in this city, he stated distinctly the relations of the English Church to the Eastern Communions. For this purpose it was absolutely

necessary that he should say that the Church of England was not responsible for the doings of Missionaries who were not acting under her authority. In so doing, he alluded not only to the Congregational Missionaries, but to ourselves, and even to some clergymen of the English Church, who were agents of voluntary societies, saying of one and all that the *Church* of England could not be held responsible for their proceedings. This was not intended as an attack upon any of us, but simply as an explanation of the true position of the English Church. It is difficult to see what objection any one could have to it. Yet as a distinctive presentation of the Church of England, it gave great offence to the Missionaries of the American Board, and this so far that one of them subsequently, during a visit to the United States, complained to our Foreign Secretary, Dr. Vaughan, that Dr. Robertson and myself had approved the proceedings of Mr. Tomlinson. The same Missionary also stated that symptoms of interference on our part were beginning to appear. On hearing this, Dr. Robertson and myself requested a conference with the Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M., and inquired whether they had any such charge to make. They replied that they had not. This was early in 1842, and after our Mission had been nearly three years in existence. About the same time, the newly appointed Bishop for Jerusalem, Dr. Alexander, arrived at the Holy City. This movement of the English Church was received with the strongest symptoms of opposition. The Secretary of the American Board, Dr. Anderson, publicly denounced it as an interference with their Missions.

I will not enlarge upon these proofs of a strong hostility to every thing like a distinct setting forth of the Episcopal Church before the Eastern Christians, further than to refer to a formal attack upon it, in the Report of the American Board for 1841, (p. 90.) All this hostility was evidently to the principle in itself, and not to any professed or declared opposition to the Missions of that Board. As time advanced, the manifestation of an extreme unwillingness that the Episcopal Church should appear here in its true character, constantly increased, and I foresaw that it would end in some violent attack upon us. Conscious, however, that no reasonable objection could be made to it, I have gone on from the beginning, using the advantages which we possess, as instruments in the great

work entrusted to my hands. I have done this, however, withou in any way interfering with the Missionaries of the American Board. In my communications with the Patriarchs, I have never so much as alluded to them, excepting when their names were brought up by others, and then have said no more of them than that they were not agents of the Church which I represented. I have uniformly refused to have any thing to do with combinations for opposing them, which I knew to exist among the Armenians. I have even declined to form acquaintance with persons whom I knew to be hostile to them, and have repeatedly declared to Armenians, who have spoken against them in my presence, that my business here was not to oppose *them*, but to do the work committed to me by my own Church. Hard speeches said against me, or against my Church, have been reported to me as coming from them. I have passed them by in silence for the sake of peace, and have endeavored to preserve a kindly feeling in my occasional intercourse with the Missionaries. On only one occasion have they intimated to me any complaint of interference or opposition, and on that occasion, I gave them the strongest assurances of the innocency of my intention, and used my utmost efforts to repair what they conceived to be an injury to them arising from an act of mine. The charges made by Dr. Anderson at the meeting of the American Board are three in number, viz: co-operating with Mr. Badger in his opposition; coinciding with Papists, and being the cause of the closing of Mr. Dwight's Church. The first two I have sufficiently answered in this letter. The last I will reply to in an Appendix, which I must defer until next post, when I engage to show, that in this matter I deserve the thanks rather than the censure of the American Board. I have seen many things in the doings of the Missionaries, which seemed to me of a most injurious tendency to the great interests of truth and piety, but I have never opposed even these. My rule has been *non-interference*. I have regarded my work as standing by itself, and have felt that my instructions would be answered by doing that well. But I have maintained in my work the great principle with which I began, and this has been a rock of offence, and ever will be.

And here it may be asked, on what ground of common reason or of justice, can the American Board or its Missionaries object to our acting upon our own principles. If, as an Episcopal

Church, we do possess certain advantages for laboring among the Eastern Christians, why should we not, why are we not bound, to use them? The reason is, that they conceive every such advantage on our part, to place them at a disadvantage. If we are known distinctively as an Episcopal Church, they must of necessity be known as Congregationalists. But this they have ever endeavored to conceal. Congregationalism is a root which will not thrive in an Eastern soil. The Oriental Christians, to use the language of a young friend of mine in a letter received to-day, "can no more conceive of a Church without a Bishop than of a man without a head." Most of them never heard of such an anomaly; and if it should appear in plain sight, they would see in it nothing to desire. It is a misfortune for Congregationalists to be here, it is a misfortune to themselves, and they would all, I believe, heartily concur in the sentiment once expressed to me by one of their most useful missionaries: "I have often wished that I were an Episcopalian. I could labor to a much greater advantage if I were one." It is natural, then, that they should wish to conceal their real character, however we may question the propriety of yielding to such a temptation. Nevertheless, it has been so far concealed, that in this city, where their Mission has been established some thirteen years, the impression STILL PREVAILS GENERALLY AMONG THE ARMENIANS, THAT THE CONGREGATIONAL MISSIONARIES ARE CLERGYMEN OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND I AM WELL ASSURED THAT TILL WITHIN TWO OR THREE YEARS, THEY WERE ALL SUPPOSED TO BE BISHOPS.* THE IMPRESSION HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED BY THEIR ADOPTING OUR CLERICAL DRESS, USING THE PRAYER BOOK, MAKING THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN BAPTISM, AND OTHER SUCH LIKE PRACTICES UNKNOWN TO CONGREGATIONALISTS AT HOME.

Now, our mode of acting, while it has been adopted solely for the sake of using our own advantages to the glory of God and the good of souls, tends to break up this old order of things, and to show both them and us as we are. No candid person ought to complain of such a result. Congregational Missionaries ought

* An Armenian Priest said to me but a short time ago, "What a singular Church theirs must be, when all their Ministers are Bishops."

to be willing to be known as such, or, if this will place them at too great a disadvantage, it is better to leave the field than not to appear in one's true character.

It is the tendency of our own movement, as I have described it, which has annoyed and irritated the American Board and its supporters. It is vain to say that it is our opposition to them, for in most of the instances which I have adduced, their dislike has been manifested either before our Missions commenced, or as soon as they began. This dislike has increased as our system has developed itself, although it has been attended, on the part of our own Church at least, with no opposition to them. You will observe that, in the cases referred to, the complaint has been not of opposition, but of the system, and the dislike is evidently aimed at *that*. The cry of opposition is an after-thought. It has only been heard in these last days. And what does it amount to? New interpretations foisted on old documents to convict the Church; and a single act of hostility, (which I pledge myself to show to be any thing but hostility,) to convict me.

And, now, what is to be the result? Are we to wear a mask, lest others be detected? Are we to forego the use of our legitimate means, because others do not possess them? Are we virtually to cease to be Episcopalians, and that when we most need to be known as such, because others cannot bear to be known as Congregationalists? Or are we quietly and stedfastly to pursue our way, turning neither to the right hand nor the left, heeding no idle clamors, but using our gifts as the Lord has given to us and as accountable to Him for the use of them? There can be but one answer to such questions as these. The whole Church will respond as one man in a cause so plainly its own, and, as I before said, great will be my surprise if this response is not felt in a new and unprecedented interest in behalf of our Eastern Missions.

HORATIO SOUTHGATE.

Constantinople, Jan. 9, 1844.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

The facts relating to the "shutting up of Mr. Dwight's Church," as it is called in the report of Dr. Anderson's remarks at the meeting of the American Board, I will state here as briefly as possible. A word, however, must be premised with regard to the character of this *Church*. Mr. Dwight, one of the Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. at Constantinople, had, for sometime, been in the habit of receiving Armenians into his house on Sundays, at an appointed hour, and preaching to them in their own language. I have never been present on such an occasion, but have often been informed that the services consisted mainly in extemporaneous prayer and a sermon, or in other words, they were Congregational services in the Armenian language, and intended for members of the Armenian Church, held also upon their own great day of religious worship, and without any sanction from the heads of their Church. These services were attended by a few Armenians, varying from twenty to thirty in number, and never, so far as I am able to learn, exceeding fifty. The idea of this meeting or Church, was from the first, a matter of alarm to some of the most pious and sober-minded among the few who attended it. They feared that it might lead to a schism in their Church—the Church in which they had been baptized. They dreaded lest it should become a nucleus, around which, at some future day a sect of seceders would be gathered. The Missionaries quieted their fears by many assurances that they had no *intention* of producing a schism, yet these fears often returned and the "English Church," as this Armeno-Congregational meeting was sometimes called among the Armenians, was frequently the subject of serious reflection, of doubt and perplexity. As time advanced, some of the most sober and intelligent

ceased to attend it. They could not overcome their apprehensions; nor could they fail to see the state of mind, which already appeared among the later comers and the less experienced—a state of mind, by whatsoever causes produced, ripe for schism. I am far from intimating that the Missionaries *intended* to produce it, since they solemnly affirm the contrary. But its existence is a fact beyond all question.

Such was the "Church," the "shutting up" of which has been attributed to my agency, and so wonderfully has the term "*Church*" wrought upon the imaginations of men, that people have been ready to think of its suspension as some great disaster brought upon a Mission of the A. B. C. F. M.; while in one paper, I notice it is spoken of as the actual extinction of the Mission itself. These exaggerations, however, are no more strange than the manner in which its suspension is attributed to me. The facts are as follows:

During the month of September 1842, while turning over one day, some old pamphlets in my study, my eye was attracted by the words, an "Evangelical Church suggested," upon the cover of a copy of the Missionary Herald, the monthly publication of the American Board. I turned to the place and read, with mingled grief and astonishment, the following paragraphs, from the Journal of Mr. Dwight. The speaker first introduced is an Armenian priest connected with the missionaries; the persons present, Messrs Goodell, Dwight, Homes and Hamlin, all the members of the Mission then in Constantinople:

"In speaking of the progress of the true light among his countrymen, he [the priest] expressed the opinion that this can be greatly extended only in one way, and that is by *a separation of those who truly believe, from the rest of the Church.* 'At present,' said he, 'while we all remain connected with the Mother Church, our hands are tied, and we are every way fettered. But if twenty men were to come out from the great body and unite together, their influence on the nation would be very great. In my opinion, within a year their number would be increased to a thousand, and within a few years, one half of our nation at the least calculation, would declare themselves evangelical.' *When asked by what means he would bring about this separation,* he did not seem exactly to know, but said, perhaps when Hohannes comes back, it may be done in the following manner: 'Let those who have been banished present a petition to the Sultan, stating that they have suffered such and such things without a cause; and desiring an investigation of their case. It will then be seen that they have been punished unjustly, and they will therefore be permitted to remain unmolested, while acting upon the principles for which they have been banished.'"

[Here ends the priest. Mr. Dwight continues:] "The *pecu-*

liar difficulty in this case lies in the fact that every Christian sect in Turkey is represented before the government by its Patriarch, this office having been instituted by the Turks themselves, and no evangelical church is recognized in this country. Of course every Armenian, whatever may be his private views, must necessarily remain connected with the Armenian community, and be subject to the watch and discipline of the Armenian Patriarch, who is clothed by the Turks with civil as well as ecclesiastical power. An individual may say he has altered his opinions, and can no longer live in fellowship with his own church, but the Turks will always class him with the Armenians, for there is nowhere else to put him, where he will have a responsible head. *It seems, therefore, very desirable that an evangelical christian sect should be acknowledged in Turkey, and be represented by its own Patriarch.* But the question, "How is this thing to be brought about," is thickly involved in difficulties. It seems to me clear, that we have nothing to do *directly* with building up such a sect. We came here not to form a sect, but to preach the gospel, and have that to exert its legitimate influence among men. Our great business is to endeavour to direct the attention of the people to the vast concerns of the soul, and to have the gospel unmixed with human ingredients, to make its own way and accomplish its own work. A separation *ought not to be forced, although it will, without doubt ultimately take place;* for light and darkness cannot always exist together. And least of all are we, who are foreigners, the men to clear away the difficulties by which this subject is encompassed, and impose ecclesiastical forms and rules upon the people.

"I should have equally strong objections to soliciting the agency of any Protestant ambassador in this matter, *unless impelled to it by pressing circumstances.* Suppose, for instance, that, in the present state of affairs, *we were to prevail on the English ambassador to request the Porte to set apart the evangelical Armenians as a separate sect, and appoint for them a Patriarch.* One of the first inquiries of the Turks would be, where are these men, and how numerous are they? And when they had ascertained that, at the most, not more than fifteen or twenty individuals, (and the number would perhaps fall short of this, at first) were wishing for any such thing, they would laugh at the idea of appointing a Patriarch for them, and send them back with instructions to remain quiet under their own Patriarch, and perhaps enforce these instructions by some salutary punishment. *There are, no doubt, very many, who would unite themselves to an evangelical sect, when once it was recognized by the government,* but probably even less than fifteen would be found in Constantinople ready to risk the consequences of openly avowing a desire to separate from their church, before such a recognition. In this

matter, the Turks would, of course, make no account of the probability that this number would be increased, for it is a rule of their government that each Christian shall remain in his own church, and no proselytism is allowed. And, if such a probability were to be suggested to them, it would be an additional motive for not granting the thing requested.

"In my opinion, *the thing must be left to take its own course.* The enlightened Armenians may be obliged in conscience, to separate to a certain extent from the mother Church. They must still, however, be subject to its laws and discipline. They will be persecuted, but, as in other cases, they will grow thereby, *until they become sufficiently numerous to attract the attention of the Turks, and make a formal separation necessary.* Nor should we forget that Providence may hasten *this most desirable consummation.*" *Missionary Herald for September*, 1840, *p.* 355.

Now let it be remembered, that the Missionaries had uniformly declared that they had no intention of producing such an effect, as is here described as a "most desirable consummation," that they had in instances almost innumerable, given such assurances to the Armenians under their teaching, and the same had been professed in Instructions from the American Board to their Missionaries,* and you may easily imagine how I was struck by this deliberate discussion of the best mode of producing that effect, and the conclusion arrived at, viz: that it is to be left in abeyance until the number of proselytes is sufficiently increased, when it will come of itself. The term "evangelical," in such a connection, I knew to be a gross misnomer. I believed, and still believe, that if such a sect were formed, it would not be the most "evangelical," but the most idle, the most useless, and the most unstable spirits which would enlist under its banners; men seeking Frank protection, men of no esteem among their own countrymen, wishing to better their condition by some new connection, men who had grudges against their Bishops or their Patriarch; these and others such like, would form the mass of this (so called) "*evangelical*" communion. It would be the most severe blow to the interests of real piety, to the good of the Armenian Church, and the welfare of souls which could be devised.

A few days afterwards, an Armenian who had formerly attended Mr. Dwight's meeting, and still professed to be kindly disposed towards the Missionaries, though disapproving the meeting, called at my house and entered into conversation with me. I had known him as an amiable, conscientious and truly pious man, with whom I had always found it a pleasure to converse. He was also a man of a sober and intelligent character. During our interview, it occured to me to ask his opinion as to the designs of the Missionaries upon the Armenian Church. I knew that he

* See Instructions to Mr. Hamlin, 1839.

had long been intimate with them, and had conversed with them in the most free and familiar manner. I read the article to him in Turkish as I have quoted it above, without omitting, changing or garbling. He at once said, that it was contrary to the views which they had always expressed to him, that he had often conversed with them upon the subject of their intentions, and they had uniformly given him assurances, to which the hopes and wishes contained in this article were a direct contradiction. He then requested me to loan him the article. I immediately declined, and added that I had alluded to it merely for the purpose of satisfying myself as to the real designs of the Missionaries, knowing that he was capable of giving me exact information on the subject. He then asked permission to mention it to others. I refused, saying that it must be regarded as strictly confidential. He asked again, if he might be allowed to mention it to Hohannes, the native assistant and bosom friend of the Missionaries. After a moment's reflection, knowing that Hohannes was the last man to use it for any evil purpose towards the Missionaries, and that he would doubtless speak of it to Mr. Dwight, from whom I should thus gain some explanation, which obviously I could not demand in person, I consented that it should be mentioned to him alone. We then parted. In some way, without my knowledge or consent, it went to a third person, and was immediately communicated to the little band of Armenians, who had received or were then receiving instruction from the Missionaries. Those who were already separated from them, saw in it proof positive of the justice of their apprehensions. I, however, knew nothing of the excitement which was prevailing, until I was informed of it by the Missionaries. About four or five days after my interview with the Armenian at my house, Messrs. Goodell and Homes called upon me, and inquired whether I would hold a conference with their Mission. I consented, and that evening was chosen for the purpose. The object of the conference was not made known to me, nor did I inquire concerning it. One had formerly been held at the request of my respected colleague, Rev. Dr. Robertson, (who had now left Constantinople,) and myself; and it was but right that I should return the compliment when desired.

We assembled in the evening at the house of Mr. Goodell. On one side, were present Messrs. Goodell, Dwight, Schauffler and Homes; on the other side, myself. Some one proposed prayer, which Mr. Schauffler offered. Mr. Dwight then stated the object of the conference, which was to make known to me, a grievance that they had to complain of, viz: my having read an article from the "Herald" to *two* Armenians. This was the first intimation which I received of any evil effect to them from what I had done. I at once stated the facts of the case as above given, correcting the mistake with regard to the number of persons to whom I had

read the article. I explained too, at length, my own feelings on reading it, and stated distinctly that my showing it to the Armenian was from no motive of hostility to them, that my only object was to gain information for my private satisfaction. I said that if I had wished to use it for their injury, I should not have shown it to a private individual, and forbidden him to mention it to any other person. I said, moreover, that the article seemed to me contrary to all their own professions. Mr. Dwight replied, that he thought it himself too strong, that it was written at a time of great excitement, and he would not write such an article now. One or two of the others present, acknowledged that if strictly weighed, it was objectionable, and one and all declared that they had no *intention* of dividing the Armenian Church. To this I replied that I could not hesitate to believe their declaration, as the testimony of Christian men. Mr. Dwight then appealed to me, whether I would not make it known to the Armenians who had been offended by the article; saying that it had done great injury, and that the persons offended would not see them (the Missionaries.) I at once assented, and promised to do all in my power to prevent any evil arising from my reading the article. I then took occasion to explain to the Missionaries, that, though I believed their own declaration that they had no positive *intention* of producing a schism, and was ready to convey that declaration to the Armenians who had drawn the contrary inference from the article, I felt bound to express my fears with regard to the real *tendency* of their labors in this respect. I thought their instructions adapted to depreciate the proper authority of the Church, and to bring it into contempt with the Armenians, that by absolutely refraining from giving any instruction upon the Sacraments, government and institutions of the Church, these things, important in their place, were left to be regarded by their hearers as utterly worthless, and that thus their attachment to their Church must be completely undermined; that it was also a direct blow against the integrity of the Church, to treat as mere superstitions such things as fasting, instead of aiming to inculcate the proper use of them; that I regarded these things as great deficiencies in their work, which if they had their natural results would inevitably lead to schism; that I supposed them to arise from their own views with regard to such matters; that the work which I would be glad to see, would be one which, while inculcating religious truths, should associate them with the institutions, sacraments and rites of the Church, which should not confound things in themselves good, with mere abuses of them, but should teach the Eastern Christians to use rightly the things which they have; which should defend and inculcate Feasts, Fasts, and the other primitive institutions of the Oriental Churches, by correcting the abuse of them, pointing out their proper use, and making them instruments to a holy life; that I was well aware that a work of

this kind, could be consistently undertaken only by the Episcopal Church, and that I should endeavour to promote it; that in doing so, my object was not to make it antagonist to theirs, but to do good in our own way; that I had not proposed to myself to oppose them, but simply to do the work committed to me; that I had avoided a position of hostility hitherto, and intended still to avoid it.

Several other topics were introduced during the conference, not connected with the affair among the Armenians, and which, therefore, I need not allude to here. After a session of about three hours, we parted in a friendly and pacific manner. The next day, I sought out the Armenian to whom I had read the extract from the "Herald," and two others who were interested in the matter, and told them of my conference with the Missionaries. I mentioned the circumstances under which it was written, as a reason for making allowance for it, and stated, in as strong terms as those in which it had been conveyed to me, the solemn declaration of the Missionaries that they had no such intention as might be inferred from the article. I insisted, moreover, that this declaration ought to be believed, for the same reason that I believed it myself and earnestly advised them to receive it as equal to and fairly counterbalancing the article. This they agreed to do, and *they at onee gave me the strongest assurances that, so far as any proceedings of theirs were concerned, the article should be as if it had never been written.* "But," they added, "whatever are the *intentions* of the Missionaries, they are doing what will produce a schism as certainly as if they designed it." "Here," said one, "is a family, some of the members of which have attended the instructions of the Missionaries. That family never sit down to dinner without quarreling about the sign of the cross.* Those who have been taught by the Misssonaries, have learned to neglect it and rebuke the others for making it. The others tell them that they are becoming infidels; and so the peace of that family is constantly disturbed by their jarrings about what is innocent and proper, if rightly used." Other instances were adduced, and among them Mr. Dwight's meeting was alluded to. "This," said the Armenians, "will cer tainly bring about a schism at last. It was just in this way that the Armenian Papists begun—by holding meetings in the houses of Papists. We have long been troubled about this meeting, and have determined to do all in our power to break it up." I replied, that I had nothing to do with any questions between them and the Missionaries, that I had come to them for a specific object, and I could not enter into other matters. To this they assented, but added, "that meet-

* It is, I believe, a universal custom among the Eastern Christians to sign themselves with the sign of the cross before eating—a custom which has prevailed in these countries from the earliest ages of Christianity.

ing must be suspended." I replied, that I had no farther concern in the matter, than to protest against their basing any action relating to it upon the article in the "Herald." They at once declared that nothing was farther from their thoughts, that their objection to the meeting was of old standing, and they should have labored, as, indeed, they had been laboring for its suspension, if they had never heard of the article.

I then left them. A few days after, I heard that a formal demand had been made to Mr. Dwight, that he should discontinue the service held at his house for the Armenians, and that Hohannes himself had recommended it. I learned these things only by distant report, and had no farther connection with the affair than I have already stated. I do not remember that I ever so much as alluded to Mr. Dwight's meeting, in the presence of any Armenian up to the time of its suspension, excepting in the single instance just stated, and in that case I said not one word against it. How, then, it will be asked, is its suspension attributed to me? I know not, unless it be that the Missionaries would say my reading the article in the "Herald" produced an excitement, and that excitement led to the demand for the suspension of the meeting. But how could this be? The article itself contained no allusion to the meeting; I never spoke of the meeting, good or evil; those who were excited by the article, declared that it had nothing to do with their objections to the meeting, and should have nothing to do with their action concerning it.* I can imagine that, being in an excited state of mind, they seized the moment to demand what they had long purposed to demand, and what they would soon have demanded if the article had not been read. But this is a very circuitous rout to travel, for the purpose of throwing the responsibility on my shoulders. And I am persuaded that it never would have been traveled if there had not been that strong feeling of jealousy towards the Episcopal Missions, which I have described in the foregoing letter, and with this I will add, as strong an unwillingness to have it known at home, that pious and intelligent Armenians had opposed the meeting.

But this is not the whole of the story. The meeting was suspended. The excitement died away. A few weeks passed, when Mr. Dwight *again opened his meeting, resumed his services, and has continued them from that time to the present without interruption.* And this is the "shutting up of Mr. Dwight's Church,"

* Within the last two weeks, I have called upon the individual to whom I read the article, and one of the two others with whom I had the conversation above narrated, to inquire what were their recollections of these events, (they occured in October, 1842, more than a year ago.) They said with one voice, that they themselves were the cause of the suspension of the meeting; that the said article had nothing to do with it; that they had kept their promise in that matter, and had demanded the suspension of the meeting on account of fears long before existing. They expressed both surprise and indignation at hearing that it had been attributed to me.

the " great disaster," the " extinction of the Mission in Turkey." The awful event is announced at the annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, is reported in the newspapers, undergoes sundry important accretions in its passage from mouth to mouth, and from pen to pen, and gives birth to an assault upon the whole Episcopal Church,* under the imposing title of " Hostility to the Missions of the American Board in the East."

I think in all this will be seen, only a new indication of that unhappy state of feeling, of which I have traced the origin and growth in my letter. When men are so anxious to find cause for offence as to seek for it in an act, in which they had the strongest evidence that no hostility was intended, and are so eager to publish accusations as to suppress or prevent the most prominent facts of a case, to what can we attribute such proceedings, but to an antecedent spirit of jealousy, that is neither to be regulated by candor nor restrained by truth.

It will also be seen in the statement which I have made, to what lengths I have gone in endeavoring to avoid a position of hostility towards the Missionaries of the American Board. I have done this not from fear, but from a high sense of duty. The assaults which have been made upon me, show how useless my endeavours have proved.

The real weight to be attached to these accusations will also appear. That which I have now examined is the only specification that has been made. The others, (such as that I am " coinciding with Papists, co-operating with another Missionary in opposition to the American Board," &c.) are such vague and general slanders as hardly deserve notice. If the only charge which has been distinctly brought out, proves utterly groundless, what may we fairly judge the others to be?

Finally, the Secretary of the American Board and the Presbyterian newspapers, have most unprovokedly declared themselves hostile to our Missions. If we are now placed in opposition to them, it is an opposition of their own choosing. If the consequences should be evil, they are the fruits of their own sowing. Let them look to it. There is one course, and one alone by which peace can be preserved. Let them consent to appear in these countries as they really are, let there be no disguise of their ecclesiastical character, let them be Presbyterian or Congregational, both in profession and practice, let them be content to meet the disadvantages of their true position, and they will find little occasion to suspect us, little reason to fear our opposing them. Until this is done, every act of ours which tends to show our own

* See New-York Observer for November 18, 1843. The article referred to, is drawn out by Dr. Anderson's remarks at the meeting of the Board, and this matter of the suspension is the only specific charge stated in those remarks.

character, every instance in which we avail ourselves of our proper advantages, the whole policy and system of our Missions, though but the legitimate use of our peculiar privileges and irrespective entirely of their operations, will be to them a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. I see not that *we* have any thing to change; nor can it be, so far as the prosperity of our Missions are concerned, (whatever we may think of the claims of honesty and open dealing upon them,) a matter of anxiety with us, whether they choose still to appear in disguise, or adopt in the East the character which they wear at home.

H. S.

Constantinople, Feb. 1, 1844.

No II.*

My Dear Friend.—You ask me to give you some account of the recent events among the Nestorians, and of the causes which led to that awful massacre, of which the heart-rending details have reached your ears. I gladly comply with your request, and the more so, because I have been myself most accurately and minutely informed of the whole matter from the beginning. These brutal murders of innocent Christians, which are to you one great and solitary tragedy, standing out in bold relief unconnected with the causes that preceded, and the consequences that have followed them, are to me but a link in a chain of events which reaches back through a long succession of years. You ask if it be true that they indeed arose from the "jealousies of rival missionaries," as some of the newspapers have reported. Let me tell you the tale as it actually occurred, and you may then judge whether religious strife had any part in the matter. But let me first say whence the report to which you allude, arose. A young man regaling himself with the summer air of the Bosphorus has a weekly task of writing a letter to one of the London journals; his stock of news is exhausted, and he turns in his mind how he shall accomplish his regular stint. He seeks for some easy subj ct of speculation, and the Nestorian Massacre presents itself. He has already given the details of it, and now he imagines that he may fill his sheet with an ingenious theory as to its cause. He pitches upon the differences which he knows are existing among certain Missionaries in Mossoul, a city indeed far removed from the scene of action, but what can distant readers know of that? He frames his theory. In the place of facts he puts surmises, and by means of sundry vague insinuations, and one rumor, which to a hasty

* Heretofore published in the Church Journals.

peruser may pass for a fact, he weaves the web of his story. Is one word of it true? Does he himself believe it? This is a matter of little importance. He has accomplished his task, and may now enjoy his repose. The letter goes to London—is published in one of the leading papers, and is seized upon by others. It passes to America, and there again runs through the papers. In how many I have seen it I can scarcely tell; the self-same letter, emanating from the idle brain of a young man on the Bosphorus. How much evil may come from one inconsiderate act! Did he reflect that he was implicating the good names of men, to whom in many respects he might well look up for example and instruction? Not for a moment. He was amusing himself with his own ingenuity, and performing his task of a letter. He never dreamed of consequences. I brought the matter back to his recollection the other day. He had not a word to say in defence of his theory.

And is it possible, I have asked myself, over and over again, that these idle lucubrations of an idle letter writer are taken by grave and intelligent men for sober truth? When I first saw the said letter in print, its gross absurdity to me, who knew the facts of the case, was so palpable, that I pointed it out to one or two others as a most eminent specimen of nonsense.

But a little knowledge of facts and circumstances makes all the difference in the world; and of this story it may at least be said, that it is not more enormous than some others that have been told of the East, and believed too.

But the subject is a serious one, and I will therefore proceed at once to give you some serious reasons, why this strange speculation of the letter-writer, is, and must be a false one—a mere fabrication that never had existence out of the writer's brains. No one here at Constantinople, I believe, ever dreamed of imputing the massacre to such a cause, excepting the author himself, and whether he believed it I seriously question. Every one with whom I have conversed, who is informed of the truth of the matter, attributes it to one single cause—the lust of Mohammedan chiefs for dominion. The Nestorians, you well know, have been an independent people for centuries. Living in the retreats of their snow-clad mountains, they have escaped the action of changes which have swept over this country. They have been unmolested, excepting their occasional quarrels with the Kurds, among whom they dwell, for ages; and they might still have been unmolested, if the ambition of the Mussulman rulers had not looked with envy upon their liberty. The Turkish government has long been anxious to subject them to its sway, for they lie within the nominal boundaries of Turkey, although owning no allegiance to its authority. A powerful Pasha was some years ago sent to subdue all the refractory and lawless tribes of Kurdistan, and bring them into subjection to the Sultan. This he had well nigh accomplished, when he was cut off by death. In the execution of his commission, he

advanced almost to the borders of the Nestorian country, and if his career had not been so suddenly terminated, *that* too would doubtless have yielded to his arms and his intrigues, as did most of Kurdistan to the west of it. But though arrested, the Turkish authorities did not abandon their purpose, and unfortunately they soon found an ally within the country itself. Nouroullah Bey, the chief of the powerful tribe of Hakkari Kurds, had long looked with a jealous eye on the power of the Nestorian Patriarch, who was a civil as well as a spiritual ruler, and as head of the Christians, was first chief of the mountains. Nouroullah Bey wished at once to break the strength of the Patriarch, and make himself a sort of Pasha over the whole country. For this end he courted alliance with some of the Turkish Pashas, promising that if they would aid him to subdue the country, he would rule as a subject of the Sultan. They listened to his suggestions and helped him with means, and I believe also with men. With their assistance he gradually acquired strength, and in 1841 had an open rupture with the Patriarch. He even deceived some of the Patriarch's own people, and attached them to his interests. *All this happened before there was a Missionary in the land.* In 1841, the Patriarch fled for refuge to another part of the country, (the Tigary district,) where among his own people he was safe at least from the Bey's design upon his person. The Bey sought to get him into his toils by stratagem, and sent him messages of peace, proposing to heal all their strifes by friendly conference. But the Patriarch would not listen to his proposals. Last winter Nouroullah Bey sent two messages to the Patriarch, inviting him to come to a certain village, and settle all the differences in a fraternal interview. The Patriarch was warned by his own people that a snare was laid for him, and civilly declined the invitation. Nouroullah Bey seeing that all hope of accomplishing his purposes by intrigue was cut off, sent to Bedi Khan Bey, another powerful chief on the borders of Kurdistan, and proposed a joint expedition for invading the Nestorian country. Bedi Khan Bey, as eager for power as the other, readily accepted it. The plan was formed; their forces joined, and they suddenly made an irruption into the Tirjari district, burning, slaughtering, and leading captive, as you have heard. This was the Nestorian Massacre.

And now, in all this, where is there any appearance of missionaries or religious discord? The events were in progress before there was a Missionary in the country. When Nouroullah Bey sent his last message to the Patriarch, the English Missionary, who has had so much of the blame to bear, had but just reached Mossoul, and whatever contentions arose between him and the American Missionaries, arose afterwards. Neither Nouroullah Bey, or Bedi Khan Bey probably ever heard of rival Missionaries, or could now tell, if the question were put to them, that the Missionaries in Mossoul are not all one body. It is idle to say that

such men, wild, barbarous Kurds, who know no more of Western Christianity than of the religion of the South Sea Islands, could be governed by such a motive to make war upon the Nestorian Christians. These men were, I presume, never in Mossoul. Certainly, they have not been there for years: they are Kurdish chiefs, who are as ignorant of most things beyond their own territories as of the regions of the moon. There is one little incident that may serve to show you how little idea they have of rival Missionaries or any thing of the kind. It was necessary before commencing their invasion, to give some pretext for it to the Pasha of Mossoul, whose country lay close upon that of the Nestorians, and whose sanction or at least indifference, it was most important for them to secure. Dr. Grant, one of the American Missionaries, had erected a spacious building in the mountains, which was intended for the use of his prospective Mission. He had erected it with the knowledge and sanction of Nouroullah Bey, who was under special obligations to him for medical aid, and who well knew that his purpose was simply to educate the Nestorians and do good. But a pretext for the war was necessary, and a report was sent to the Pasha of Mossoul that the "English" were building a fort in the mountains, and might afterwards come and possess the land. The Kurds did not know enough to distinguish between English and Americans, but confounded them, as ignorant people generally do in this country. How little this looks like being moved by the jealousies of rival Missionaries, you will at once see. They did not even know that there were different bodies of foreigners at Mossoul. English as well as Americans were involved by this pretext, and I happen to know, that it gave the English Missionary no small trouble. How idle then, and I must say how wicked the insinuation, half conveyed, half withheld, by the letter writer to whom I have alluded, that the English Missionary himself was the author of the report to the Pasha! I cannot away with such dreadful trifling with truth and men's characters. It deserves the severest reprehension.

The statement which I have given of the real and only cause of the Massacre, is drawn chiefly from documents, which have recently been before me from the Patriarch himself, and he, we must allow, ought to know the real origin of his troubles better than others. The history of the thing, however, has been familiar to me for years. I was the first American who ever visited Mossoul, and I believe I was the first Protestant traveller who made inquiries among the Nestorians in that quarter. I knew of the state of things then or soon after, and more than a year ago, (before the English Mission had reached Mossoul,) I was making efforts here to arrest the evils that were coming upon the Nestorians. How futile then, to say, that that Mission contending with the Americans, brought about these evils.

I trust I have said enough to show you that Missionary opera-

tions or Missionary jealousies had nothing to do with the Nestorian Massacre. You remark that the course of the Rev. Mr. Badger, the English Missionary, has been much condemned. I agree with you in thinking that his hostile bearing towards the American Missionaries is deserving of censure. No one regrets it more than I. No good, but much evil must come of such contentions. But I should not do justice to the man, if I were not to say, that he is a true friend to the Nestorians, and has been indefatigable in his efforts for their welfare. He has now with him three Nestorian priests, with their families, who have fled from their ravaged country, and are dependant upon him for support. He has spared neither time nor labor to secure to the Nestorians their violated rights, and to procure the restoration of the prisoners, and the re-establishment of the Patriarch in his own land. He is the last man to be suspected of injuring the Nestorians. He has shown himself, throughout these troubles, their unwearied benefactor; and of this we must give him the praise, however much his line of policy with regard to the other Missionaries, is liable to exception. You already know that I have no partialities which would lead me to speak better of him than he deserves, but I would render to all their due.

H. S.

Constantinople, December 6, 1843.